

24th August 1925]

(d) whether it is a fact that the last survey was done perfunctorily in many cases and that the present survey is undertaken in order to correct the errors of the last survey and not the changes which have been duly recorded by the Land Records Department; and

(e) whether there is sufficient justification for throwing the cost wholly or partly on the ryots of the district?

A.—(a) The resurvey of the whole district has not been ordered. A cadastral resurvey of the old Kasaragod taluk excepting the Kumari villages is in progress. This has been ordered because (1) a large number of stones are missing, (2) there are no plottable records of measurement for a large number of fields, and it is therefore impracticable to map therein new subdivisions. The Government Order referred to by the hon. Member does not constitute a land records department but provides Collectors with an inspecting agency to enable them to see that the land revenue staff is properly trained in survey and carries out the revenue rules regarding the making and record of changes.

(b) (i) The establishment now employed in the field is—

Sub-Assistants	...	...	4
Head surveyors	...	...	4
Deputy surveyors	...	...	62
Field surveyors	...	...	160

(ii) Including the pay of officers, clerks, draughtsmen and incidentals but excluding the cost of boundary pillars and hired labour, the annual cost of the survey party will be about Rs. 1,60,000.

(c) The approximate cost of a cadastral resurvey of the whole district cannot be accurately estimated. A great deal of it is hill and jungle where a cadastral survey will not be made. It has not yet been decided whether a cadastral resurvey elsewhere than in the tract specified in clause (a) will be necessary.

(d) No; but the last survey was made on a method which makes it difficult to record changes and the resurvey now being made in Kasaragod taluk will remedy this defect and provide every registered holder of land with a proper record of measurement of his holding.

(e) The hon. Member is referred to section 8 of the Act, Madras Survey and Boundaries Act VIII of 1923. The whole cost of the survey is in no case thrown on the ryots.

### Village Establishments.

*Number of vettians, etc., dismissed from service.*

\* 336 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) how many vettians and talaiyaris were dismissed or stopped from their services since 1924 together with their names, village and district to which they belong separately; and



[24th August 1925]

(b) what are the reasons for so doing and the number of years' service they had put in?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have not the information required.

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—“ With reference to the answer given in clauses (a) and (b), it was brought to my notice that in several districts where the vettians and talaiyaris who were very loyal to the Government and who put in service for a very long time were dismissed. I therefore wish to know whether at least, on hearing this representation, the Government will be pleased to call for the information. I have no objection to give particular instances.”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ If the hon. Member gives me the names of the districts where the vettians and talaiyaris were dismissed, I shall be glad to get the information for him. I suppose he wishes the information for the current year. He says ‘since 1924’, which means for the current year.”

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—“ Yes : Salem, Coimbatore and Madura districts.”

### Arms and Explosives.

#### *Guns in Gudem taluk.*

\* 337 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that all the guns in the Gudem taluk of the Vizagapatam Agency were taken away by the Government;

(b) what is the object aimed at in so doing;

(c) what is the authority under which the guns were taken away and the number of guns taken away; and

(d) what are the principles on which the Government grant permission to the hill people to possess guns?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government have no information.

(d) The hon. Member is referred to item (1) in Schedule IV of the Indian Arms Rules, 1924, by virtue of which the Agency tracts in this Presidency have been withdrawn from the prohibitions and directions contained in the Indian Arms Act, except those contained in sections 12 and 25, in respect of all arms other than cannon and breech-loading arms.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ With reference to the answer given to clauses (a), (b) and (c), will the Government be pleased to call for the information as to whether the guns were taken away from the hill men?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ I regret I was not aware that this question was appearing in the agenda paper to-day. I shall be glad to call for the information.”